

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance respectfully are requested.

In paragraph 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Although Applicant does not agree with the objection, in order to speed prosecution of this application to allowance, in response, applicant has canceled claims 20, 23, 28 and 31 without prejudice.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In response, Applicant has taken the following actions:

- Amended claim 4 to recite proper antecedent basis;
- amended claims 26 and 27 to recite “book” as the preamble; and
- canceled claim 20.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10 and 25 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Betancourt ‘118. In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite the limitations of non-rejected claim 2 and has canceled claim 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 7, 21, 22 and 24 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Rice ‘253. In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite the limitations of non-rejected claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 25 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Spencer ‘696. Applicant has canceled Claim 25, thereby rendering this ground of rejection moot.

In paragraphs 7-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 9 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Rice '253 in view of Muller '628. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome by the amendment to Claim 1.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Rice '253 in view of Graham '048 or McGill '353. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome by the amendment to Claim 1.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 19-20 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Rice '253 or Betancourt '118 in view of Wertzberger '298. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome by the amendment to Claim 1 and the cancellation of Claim 20.

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 23 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Rice '253 or Betancourt '118 in view of Nathanson '439. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of Claim 23.

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 28 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Rice '253 or Betancourt '118 in view of Lake '615. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of Claim 28.

In paragraphs 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 31-32 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Betancourt '118 in view of Garrett '526. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of Claims 31-32.

In paragraph 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 4 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Betancourt '118 in view of Anthon '356. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome by the amendment to Claim 1.

In paragraph 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 29-30 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Betancourt '118 in view of Anthon '356 and Mealand '188. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome by the amendment to Claim 1 (from which claim 4 depends).

Applicant notes that the Examiner in paragraph 16 of the Office Action indicated that Claims 2, 5, 12-18 and 33-34 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten independent form. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite the limitations of Claim 2 and has rewritten Claim 5 in independent form. All remaining claims either originally depended from an allowed claim or have been amended herein to cite dependence from an allowed claim.

Applicant also notes that the Examiner stated in the Conclusion of the Office Action that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent as of interest to the disclosure, but not used to reject any claims.

Favorable consideration and early allowance is respectfully requested and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alan B. Clement', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Alan B. Clement  
Reg. No. 34,563

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989